Supp'y of Electricity to Midigesi Hobli, Madhugiri Taluk.

Q.—557. Sri C. T. HANUMANTHAIYA (Pavagada—Scheduled Castes).—

Will the Government be pleased to state.—

(*a*) when the raiyats of Midigesi Hobli of Madhugiri Taluk applied with the necessary deposit for the supply of electricity for wells;

(*b*) the reason for not giving it till now;

(*c*) whether funds for the supply of electricity to Midigesi Hobli will be provided in the Budget estimates of the current year?

A.—Dr. R NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—

(*a*) Once in July or August 1953 and again in October 1954.

(*b*) For want of sufficient number of applicants in the first instance.

(*c*) The question of taking up the work during the year 1955-56 is being examined.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಮಧುಗಿರಿ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು, ಮಿಡಿಗೇಶಿ ಹೋಬಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ರೈತರು ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಂದಿ ಹಣ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ?

*Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—Sir, originally about 80 persons asked for pumping sets. An estimate for power supply was made costing about 5.44 lakhs. But since this was costing 1,000 per H.P., it was not taken up. Later on we have had applications from 20 more persons.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಹಿಂದೆ ಈ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಯೇನಾದರೂ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿತ್ತೆ?

Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA.—I do not remember that, Sir.

ಶ್ರೀ ಸಿ. ಟಿ. ಹನುಮಂತಯ್ಯ.—ಆ ಪ್ರಾಂತದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭಾವಿಗಳಿವೆ. ಅದರಿಂದಲೇ ಈಗ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಜೀವನ ನಡೆಯುವುದೇ ಕಷ್ಟವೆಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೆ?

ಡಾ. ಆರ್. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ರಿವೈಜ್ಡ್ ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗೆ ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಈಗ ಪರಿಶೀಲನೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ. 1955-56ರಲ್ಲಿ ಮಂಜೂರು ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇವೆ.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Sri Mudduramaiah is permitted to put the question.

Power and Light Section Office (Opening at Chikballapur).

Q.—745. Sri MUDDURAMIAH (Koratagere-Madhugiri) [on behalf of Sri Mali Mariappa (Pavagada)].—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether they are aware that the section office, Power and Light, Chikballapur, is unwieldy on account of the extensive area covered by the section;

(*b*) whether they are contemplating to open another section office at Tumkur to avoid delay and congestion?

A.—Dr. R. NAGAN GOWDA (Minister for Agriculture).—

(*a*) This is one of the larger sections in the State.

(*b*) The question is under consideration in connection with the Reorganisation proposals.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುದ್ದುರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರಕ್ಕೆ ಎಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಲೈನು ಹಾಕಿದೆ?

*ಡಾ. ಆರ್. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ.—ತುಮಕೂರಿನಿಂದ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುದ್ದುರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ತುಮಕೂರಿನಿಂದ ಚಿಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರಕ್ಕೆ ನೂರು ಮೈಲಿಗಳ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ದೂರವಿದೆಯಲ್ಲವೆ?

ಡಾ. ಆರ್. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ.—ಮೊದಲು ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಲೈನನ್ನು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಎಳೆದಾಗ ಚಿಕ್ಕಬಳ್ಳಾಪುರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಆಫೀಸು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅಲ್ಲಿಂದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗಿತ್ತು. ಇತ್ತೀಚೆಗೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಅಪ್ಲಿಕೇಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಆದಕಾರಣ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇರೆ ವಿಚಾರಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಮುದ್ದುರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಈಗ 100 ಮೈಲಿಗೆ ವಿದ್ಯುಚ್ಛಕ್ತಿ ಸರಬರಾಯಿ ಮಾಡಲು ಕಾಲವಿಳಂಬವಾಗುವುದು ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಹಣವೂ ಸಹ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೆ?

ಡಾ. ಆರ್. ನಾಗನಗೌಡ.—ಅದಕ್ಕೇ ಈಗ ತುಮಕೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಮಾಡಲು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದೇವೆ.

Bus line from Bangalore to Hosur (Issue of Permit by S.T.A.)

Q.—797. Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY (Mysore City South).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) whether a permit is granted by the State Transport Authority to

run a bus on Bangalore-Hosur line; if so, to whom;

(*b*) when was this line advertised?

A.—**Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA** (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) Yes.

Sri D. H. Aswathanarayana.

(*b*) In Notification No. S.T.A. 5960 of 1954-55, dated 3rd September 1954.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Is it not the S.T.A. that have sanctioned this line Sir?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Yes Sir.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Was this line advertised prior to 1954 at any time?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There was an advertisement for this line in the year 1952. The requisite information from the R.T.A. Salem was received in 1954 By that time there was a change of the office of the S.T.A. There was change from the old set up to new set up. That was how it was found....

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—You have stated that it was advertised in 19 2: why was this re-advertised Sir?

***Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.**—That is what I was explaining. After being advertised in 1952, by the time the requisite information was received from Salem, that was July 1954. By that time, there was a change in the system of S.T.A. and it was found necessary to advertise again for the second time and call for reports because two years had elapsed and therefore they had to re-advertise and call for fresh applications.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that the person who was allotted this line was not an applicant in 1952?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That is the subject of an appeal now. One of the parties who had applied has preferred an appeal against the recommen ations of S.T.A. That is now before the Government for disposal.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Is it not a fact that the file concerning the advert sement and the applications in the 1952 is missing?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Yes, it is reported so.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—What action has the Government taken in the matter?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The concerned clerk has been fined.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—What about the officer who was in charge of the file?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The report I have received is to the effect that the concerned clerk who was the custodian of the papers could not produce them; it was more than 2 to 2½ years. After enquiry, it is stated that the clerk has been fined. If you say the concerned officer, I am not able to know who that officer is?

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—The Secretary of the S.T.A., what was he doing regarding these records? The clerk has been punished and the officer has been allowed to go. I would like to know the reason for this.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—When it was brought to the notice of the Chairman of the S.T.A., he caused an enquiry to be instituted and after an enquiry, I am given to understand that the concerned clerk who was said to be the custodian of that paper, has been fined. If it is the opinion of the Hon'ble Member that some others also are involved and it requires fuller investigation, I have no objection to refer this to the Special Officer, Efficiency Audit and get it examined and find out if there are others also culpable.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—When this line was re-advertised, were the cases of the applicants who had sent in applications in 1952, were also considered, Sir?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I have said that the records concerning the applications of 1952 are not forthcoming and in its absence, I am not able to say whether the person to whom the permit had been given by the S.T.A., was one of those who applied in 1952.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Was it not the duty of the S.T.A., to have given an opportunity to those who had applied in 1952 and consider their cases also?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That matter is before the Government in appeal. The Hon'ble Minister cannot give a decision now.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—The appeal is between the applicants of the year 1954. My question is whether the cases of applicants who had applied in 1952 were considered in 1954?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—That is exactly I am not able to answer for the simple reason that I just do not know who were those who had applied in 1952. I have a Gazette Notification to show that applications were called for. But the S.T.A. thought that under any circumstances there must be a re-advertisement. In pursuance of the re-advertisement, as many as 12 persons had applied. I have got the list also. Therefore, I am not in a position to say whether all those who applied in the year 1952 had also applied in 1954.

Sri B. NARAYANASWAMY.—Sir, what were the merits that made S.T.A. to give the line to the applicant by name Aswathanarayana?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think that arises. This is a matter in dispute, in appeal. It has to be gone into.

Government Road Transport Vehicles (Third Party Risk Insurance).

Q.—811. Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK (Molakalmuru).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(*a*) the number of buses, cars, motor cycles and vans that the Government Road Transport is maintaining;

(*b*) the amount involved if all of them are insured for third party risk;

(*c*) the amount involved if all of them are insured for comprehensive risk;

(*d*) the net income that Government Road Transport has derived for the year 1954-55;

(*e*) the total investment made by them on this concern?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(*a*) 1. Buses ... 163.
2. Car ... 1.
3. Vans ... 4.
4. Motor-Cycles . 5.

(*b*) Rs. 20,000 Approximately per annum.

(*c*) Rs. 81,100 approximately per annum.

(*d*) Up to end of January 1955: Rs. 12,06,755 (as per provisional accounts).

(*e*) Investment as on 1st April 1954: Rs. 21,30,801.

12-30 P.M.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—What was the gross income during the year under reference, Sir, *i.e.*, up to end of January 1955?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That information was supplied in the previous answer.

*Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—There was already information given with regard to that point in the previous question.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—What was the percentage of income on investment? You have stated that the net income was Rs. 12,06,755 on an investment of Rs. 21,30,801. Does it not work to 75 per cent?

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—So far as the investment is concerned, it is a variable figure. After depreciation the investment goes on adding. So far as this figure, *i.e.*, 12,06,755 is concerned, this is given by the Accounts Officer as a fact.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—I want to know whether the Government can definitely say that the investment is not more than 21 lakhs.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—I believe I have no reason to think that I am wrong.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—By the way of expressing it perhaps I am very doubtful whether it is correct. Because on the investment .....

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—There is no room for doubt when figures are given.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Is it 75 per cent? Is that the income on the investment? I want to know. I want to know the percentage of income on the investment.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA.—It is a matter of calculation. It is not so much as information.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is why I am saying. It is a thing which I